DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 696 VT 016 153

AUTHOR	Brown, Betty Jean
TITLE	The Qaulities of an Effective Pre-vocational Business Education Teacher.
SPONS AGENCY	Tennessee Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational Education, Knoxville.; Tennessee State Dept. of Education, Nashville. Div. of Vocational-Technical Education.
REPORT NO	RS-7
PUB DATE	Jun 71
NOTE	33p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Business Education; Check Lists; *Effective Teaching; *Student Opinion; Supervisors; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Rating
IDENTIFIERS	General Business

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between student and supervisor evaluations of the effectiveness of general business teachers. A secondary purpose was to identify qualities of effective general business teachers through the use of a performance specimen checklist and a rating scale. The population of the study consisted of 30 general business teachers in selected East Tennessee high schools, their immediate supervisors, and their general business students. Among the findings were: (1) There was no significant relationship between years of teaching experience and teaching effectiveness in general business as evaluated by students, (2) There was a significant relationship between number of years of teaching experience and scores assigned by immediate supervisors of general business teachers, (3) There was no significant relationship between years of outside work experience and teaching effectiveness, (4) There was a significant relationship between student evaluations and immediate supervisor evaluations of teaching effectiveness, and (5) There are distinguishing characteristics that differentiate between effective and ineffective teachers. (Author/JS)

ED 065696

Mini-Grant Project Research Reports

Mini-Grant Project Research Reports

Mini-Grant Project Research Reports

THE QUALITIES OF AN EFFECTIVE PRE-VOCATIONAL BUSINESS EDUCATION TEACHER

VT016153

1971-1972

1971-1972

1971-1972

Tennessee Research Coordinating Unit

Research Series No. 7

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE QUALITIES OF AN EFFECTIVE PRE-VOCATIONAL BUSINESS EDUCATION TEACHER

A Mini-Grant Research Project
Presented to
The Tennessee Research Coordinating Unit

by
Betty Jean Brown

June 1971

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Tennessee Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational Education, 909 Mountcastle Street, Knoxville, Tennessee, in cooperation with the University of Tennessee College of Education and the State Division of Vocational-Technical Education.

It has been prepared for distribution to selected agencies and individuals on a complimentary basis as permitted by funding under terms of the contract.

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between student and supervisor evaluations of teaching effectiveness of general business teachers. Secondary purposes were to identify qualities of effective general business teachers through use of a performance specimen checklist, developed in this study, and a supervisors' rating scale, developed by the DELPHI Technique with the assistance of eight national leaders in general business.

The population of this study consisted of thirty general business teachers in selected East Tennessee high schools, their immediate supervisors in those schools, and their classes of general business students for the 1970-71 school year. A performance specimen checklist was developed for evaluating general business teachers from specimens of good and poor teaching behavior collected from general business students in East Tennessee. A supervisors' rating scale was developed through the DELPHI technique and included characteristics of good general business teachers considered essential by the panel of experts used in the study. A questionnaire for collecting background information from general business teachers was developed from literature and similar studies.

The performance specimen checklist was validated by correlating the E/I scores and overall evaluation scores assigned by students to the thirty general business teachers. Reliability for the checklist was established by using the split-halves method and Spearman-Brown Prophecy

formula. A Chi Square item analysis determined the power of specimens on the checklist to discriminate between effective and ineffective teaching. The mean E/I scores and mean overall evaluation scores from the checklist were converted to standard scores and summed to determine a teaching effectiveness score for each teacher. Ratings assigned on the supervisors' rating scale to those teachers by their immediate supervisors were converted to standard scores, also, so that they could be compared with student evaluations.

The most effective teachers and least effective teachers, as judged by students and by supervisors, were compared to determine whether there was a relationship in evaluations of those teachers grouped by years of teaching experience, years of general business teaching, and years of outside work experience. One-way analysis of variance was used to test those relationships. T tests were used to determine whether students and supervisors evaluated most effective and least effective teachers differently. Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to determine the relationship between supervisor and student evaluations of the most effective and least effective teachers.

Major findings of the study were:

1. There was no significant relationship between years of teaching experience and teaching effectiveness in general business as evaluated by students.

2. There was a significant relationship between number of years of teaching experience and scores assigned by immediate supervisors of general business teachers. The supervisors rated teachers with fewer years of teaching (0-6 years) as more effective teachers, in general.

3. There was no significant relationship between years of experience in general business teaching and teaching effectiveness in general business as evaluated by students or immediate supervisors.

4. There was no significant relationship between years of outside work experience and teaching effectiveness in general business as evaluated by either students or supervisors.

5. There was a significant relationship between student evaluations and immediate supervisor evaluations of teaching effectiveness in general business. However, the correlation was only .491; the coefficient of determination was .2411, indicating that only approximately 24 percent of the variation in one set of scores (supervisor or student evaluations) was accounted for by variation in the other set of scores.

6. The performance specimen checklist used for student evaluation of teaching effectiveness was a valid and reliable instrument.

7. There are distinguishing characteristics that differentiate between effective and ineffective teachers in general business. Fifty-nine of the items included on the checklist used in this study for student evaluation of teaching effectiveness were able to discriminate between effective and ineffective teachers.

8. Use of the entire rating scale developed in this study for supervisor evaluation of teacher effectiveness resulted in an evaluation that correlated to some degree with student evaluations. However, because that correlation was not high, it would appear that students and supervisors used different criteria in their evaluation of teacher effectiveness. Therefore, student evaluations should be considered by supervisors in attempting to evaluate teacher effectiveness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	i
Statement of Problem	1
Objectives	1
Methodology	3
Interpretation of Data	7
Conclusions	9
Observations	9
Recommendations	10
Appendices	
Appendix A Supervisor's Rating Scale for General Business Teachers	14
Appendix B Questionnaire: Background Factors of General Business Teachers	18
Appendix C General Business Teachers Performance Specimen Checklist	20
Appendix D Cover Letter	25

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The primary purpose of this project was to determine the relationship between student and supervisor evaluations of the teaching effectiveness of general business teachers. Secondary purposes were to identify the qualities of effective general business teachers through the use of a performance specimen checklist for student evaluation and to describe background factors of teachers judged as effective. Those factors determined whether there is a commonality of experience or preparation of general business teachers who are effective in the classroom.

OBJECTIVES

Meeting the objectives required answers to the following questions:

1. What do high school students consider as specimens of good and poor teaching performance in general business classes?
2. What are the characteristics of an effective general business teacher as judged by leaders in the general business field?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the ratings of a teacher by students and by immediate supervisors?
4. Are certain background factors significant in teaching effectiveness?
5. What are the characteristics of an effective general business teacher as identified by an analysis of performance specimens checked by students and teacher characteristics rated by a teacher's immediate supervisor?

The following assumptions were made:

1. The project study was based on the premise that students are competent evaluators of teacher effectiveness.
2. The performance specimen checklist developed for this study listed behaviors of general business teachers that could be observed by their students.
3. The immediate supervisor of a general business teacher was more qualified than any other supervisor, through observation of that teacher at work, to judge the quality of performance.

The project was limited to:

1. A collection of specimens of performance from high school students in general business classes in East Tennessee and to a collection of characteristics of an effective general business teacher identified by eight recognized leaders in general business education.
2. A sample of general business teachers in East Tennessee for evaluation by students of their effectiveness in teaching general business through the use of a performance specimen checklist and by immediate supervisors through the use of a five-point supervisors' rating scale. Teachers and students were chosen from a list of schools compiled from the records of the Tennessee State Department of Education. The 102 schools for whom records were furnished were included in the original population for the study. Thirty teachers were selected from those 102 schools as the sample.
3. An evaluation of teaching effectiveness through use of a performance specimen checklist and a supervisors' rating scale.

METHODOLOGY

Procedures for collecting and analyzing the data were as follows:

Supervisors' rating scale:

To obtain data needed to construct the supervisors' questionnaire, the author used the Delphi Technique to obtain desirable teacher characteristics. Eight business education leaders were asked to respond to a series of three questionnaires to identify characteristics of effective general business teachers. The selected "essential" characteristics were arranged into three sections on the rating scale: Classroom performance, personal qualifications of general business teachers, and professional preparation. The characteristics were then arranged to allow scoring under five rank order categories.

They were:

1 - Poor. Teacher does not have this characteristic.

2 - Below Average. Characteristic is rarely observed in this general business teacher.

3 - Average. Characteristic is sometimes present and sometimes not observable. Teacher does not have any more or any less of this characteristic than the "average" teacher I know.

4 - Above Average. Teacher has some degree of this characteristic, more than an "average" teacher.

5 - Excellent. Characteristic is present in this general business teacher to a great degree.

The supervisors' Rating Scale is shown in Appendix A.

Teacher Background Information Questionnaire:

A questionnaire (see Appendix B) was developed to collect background information about teachers and their preparation for teaching general business. The following areas were included:

1. Years of teaching experience
2. Years of teaching general business
3. Years of outside work experience
4. Degree earned
5. Undergraduate major
6. Professional preparation
7. Certification
8. Student teaching experience

The teachers included in the study completed the questionnaire during the time students completed the performance specimen checklist.

The Performance Specimen Case Checklist:

A performance specimen checklist was compiled from student-observed teacher behaviors. Students were asked to respond to teacher behavior by indicating either an example of good teaching or poor teaching. A total of 538 students participated. They generated 1,659 incidents of good and poor teaching behaviors. Those incidents were condensed because of duplication. The final evaluation form, the Performance Specimen Checklist, contained 68 items; 34 good teaching behaviors, and 34 examples of poor teaching behaviors.

The sufficiency of the final checklist was tested by students in two classes. New specimens did not appear in their listings; therefore, the Specimen Checklist was considered adequate.

Validation of the checklist was determined by a student's overall rating of the teacher in five categories: A - excellent, B - above average, C - average, D - below average, and F - poor.

A sample of the Performance Specimen Checklist is found in Appendix C.

Because of the length of the State of Tennessee and the distances between high schools in various areas of the State, the study was limited to East Tennessee. The general business teachers selected for the study were randomly chosen from a list of 102 schools in East Tennessee. Requests to participate were made to 52 randomly selected teachers. After three mailings, 30 teachers in 22 schools agreed to and did participate.

The immediate supervisor was defined as the principal, department head or chairman, or that person to whom the teacher is directly responsible. All 30 supervisors contacted agreed to and did participate.

The general business classes that became a part of the study were chosen by the investigator. The selection criteria were practicality and convenience for the investigator. Seventeen classes were the only general business classes taught by a given teacher. Thirteen teachers had more than one general business class, and the selection in this case was based on convenience and practicality.

All data for the study were collected during visits to the schools by the investigator; the teacher completed the questionnaire for background information, the immediate supervisor completed the supervisors' rating scale, and a class of general business students completed the checklists and evaluated their teacher's effectiveness. The data collected were coded so that the information could be punched into two sets of IBM

card for analysis by an IBM 402 Accounting Machine and an IBM 360/65 computer on the University of Tennessee campus.

Data from the performance specimen checklist were punched into the first card; and in the second card, the data from the questionnaire on background factors and the supervisors' rating scale were punched.

On the first card, the data were coded "1" if a specimen was checked and "0" if the specimen was not checked. The letter grade assigned to the teacher's performance by the student as an overall evaluation was recorded as a letter grade. For computer analysis of the data, the computer program assigned the value of 5.0 for an "A"; 4.0 for a "B"; 3.0 for a "C"; 2.0 for a "D"; and 1.0 for an "F" grade.

Each of the thirty teachers was given a code number. That number was recorded on all data cards for a particular teacher. Card one, columns 1-68, contained codes for the sixty-eight specimens on the performance specimen checklist; column 70 contained the letter grade assigned by the student; column 75 was punched with a "1" code to identify the card as a student evaluation card; columns 77-78 were punched with the number assigned to the teacher; and columns 79-80 contained the student number from the checklist. When all data were punched, there were 719 IBM "1" cards, one for each student who participated in the study.

Card two contained the background data collected from the thirty general business teachers: years of experience in teaching, years of experience in teaching general business, years of outside work experience, college degrees earned, undergraduate major, professional preparation for teaching general business, certification for general business, and student teaching experience in general business.

The thirty ratings assigned to teachers by their immediate supervisors in this study were coded with ratings of one to five. A rating of 5 was excellent; 4, above average; 3, average; 2, below average; and 1, poor.

Card two also contained an identification code of "2" and teacher number. Thirty "2" IBM cards were prepared, one for each teacher included in the study.

INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The major findings of this study were as follows:

1. There was no significant relationship between number of years of teaching experience and teaching effectiveness in general business, as evaluated by students.

The teachers had varied backgrounds of preparation for teaching. Of thirty teachers, fifteen had majors in business education as undergraduate students; one of those fifteen teachers has a second major in social studies. Twelve teachers had majored in some area of business administration, including the areas of marketing, transportation, management, and office administration. Two teachers had major areas in social studies, with one of those teachers having a double major in social studies and in secretarial science. One teacher was a home economics major in undergraduate school.

Nineteen of the teachers had completed an undergraduate methods course in the teaching of basic business subjects. Eleven had not taken a methods course in their undergraduate work, and eight of those teachers

were undergraduate majors in business education. Eleven of the teachers had taken a graduate course in methods of teaching basic business subjects; six of those teachers were not business education majors.

2. There was a significant relationship between number of years of teaching experience and scores assigned by immediate supervisors of general business teachers evaluated as most effective and least teachers by those supervisors. The supervisors generally rated teachers with fewer years of teaching experience (0-6 years) as more effective teachers.
3. There was no significant relationship between years of experience in general business teaching and teaching effectiveness in general business as evaluated by either students or immediate supervisors.
4. There was no significant relationship between years of outside work experience and teaching effectiveness in general business as evaluated by either students or supervisors.
5. There were differences in the way students and supervisors evaluated teaching effectiveness. The relationship between student evaluations and immediate supervisor evaluations of teaching effectiveness in general business was significant at the .01 level.
6. The performance specimen checklist used for student evaluation of teaching effectiveness was a valid and reliable instrument.
7. There were highly significant (to the .001 level) differences in the way supervisors evaluated effective and ineffective teachers.

8. Use of the total supervisors' rating scale resulted in an evaluation of teacher effectiveness by supervisors that correlated with student evaluations on the performance specimen checklist. However, none of the three sections of the rating scale used individually correlated significantly with student evaluation.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The performance specimen checklist developed in this study is an appropriate instrument for measuring teacher effectiveness as judged by students.
2. The supervisors' rating scale, used in its entirety, is an appropriate instrument for measuring teacher effectiveness as judged by immediate supervisors of general business teachers.
3. There was a positive relationship between the evaluation of teacher effectiveness by students and by immediate supervisors. However, because that correlation coefficient was only .491, the conclusion was drawn that there are differences in the criteria used by supervisors and by students in evaluating teacher effectiveness.

OBSERVATIONS

Some observations that were not statistically proven by the findings resulted from this study. The supervisors' rating scale included items

related to the ability of the teacher to provide an interesting experience in general business for the students. The rating scale also included characteristics which relate to the personality of the teacher and his ability to relate to students and to help them to feel that the general business class can be a worthwhile experience for them.

On the student performance specimen checklist, eight of ten specimens which had the highest discrimination were related to involvement of the students in the class and the effect that the teacher as a person had on the students.

These examples illustrate the need for teachers to consider the effect they, as persons, have on the students they teach.

Factors other than teaching experience, such as the personality of the teacher, rapport with students, and involvement of students in a variety of activities in the classroom, play a more important part in teaching effectiveness as evaluated by immediate supervisors and students. Teaching experience, whether in general business or in all areas of teaching, was not a primary factor in teaching effectiveness scores in this study.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions of the study fostered the following recommendations:

1. The performance specimen checklist developed for this study could be used by general business teachers for student evaluation of their teaching effectiveness and self-improvement in general business classes. Although no absolute definition of effectiveness can be determined from checklist scores, a teacher

can tally the number of effective and ineffective items and determine whether there is a pattern that would indicate behaviors needing improvement.

2. Immediate supervisors of general business teachers could consult students for evaluation of teaching effectiveness in determining teacher assignments. Results indicate students are capable of this task.
3. Teaching effectiveness in general business should not be judged only on the basis of years of experience in teaching, in general business teaching, or in outside work experience.

Other studies were suggested to solve the problems identified or not resolved by the study:

1. The effect of the temperament of a teacher on teaching effectiveness. Determine whether teacher temperament is a significant factor in effectiveness.
2. The relationship of student achievement to teaching effectiveness.
3. The study should be replicated in other areas of the country before the results are applied to all general business teachers and students.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SUPERVISORS' RATING SCALE FOR GENERAL BUSINESS TEACHERS

Teacher:_____ Code_____

Based on all of your experiences in working with and observing this general business teacher, please check the scale for the teaching characteristics listed below, according to the following code:

5 - Excellent--Characteristic is present in this general business teacher to a great degree.

4 - Above Average--Teacher has some degree of the characteristic, more than an "average" teacher.

3 - Average--Characteristic is sometimes present and sometimes not observable. Teacher does not have any more or less of this characteristic than the "average" teacher I know.

2 - Below Average--Characteristic is rarely observed in this general business teacher.

1 - Poor--Teacher does not have this characteristic.

Classroom Performance	1	2	3	4	5
1. Collects and uses effectively teaching aids to supplement traditional instruction materials.	1				
2. Makes assignments to students according to individual interests, purposes, and abilities.	2.				
3. Stimulates student interest and participation in class activities.	3.				
4. Allows the student to express ideas and to initiate questions, and will forego a pre-planned class procedure to adapt to a student-initiated procedure.	4.				
5. Uses community resources to improve instruction.	5.				
6. Establishes, with students' participation, objectives for the general business course and focuses his classroom activities on achieving those goals	6.				
7. Reviews his files of teaching aids and materials periodically to retain what is useful and destroy what is no longer needed	7.				

		1	2	3	4	5
8.	Keeps students apprised of their progress in class	8.				
9.	Respects the values of minority groups	9.				
10.	Does not "preach" his values to students	10.				
11.	Is tolerant of opinions other than his own	11.				
12.	Relates the content of general business to other fields of knowledge, and particularly to economic concepts and problems	12.				
13.	Effectively uses modern technological aids, such as audio-visual media and materials and self-instruction materials	13.				

Personal Qualifications of General Business Teachers

14.	Understands and cares about boys and girls in groups as well as individually	14.				
15.	Is interested in and enthusiastic about general business teaching	15.				
16.	Knows that he does not know or need to know all the answers	16.				
17.	Listens attentively to ideas expressed by others	17.				
18.	Generates enthusiasm for students and for teaching	18.				
19.	Has empathy for people	19.				
20.	Possesses personal skills which enable him to communicate directly, by example, and by contagion	20.				
21.	Has imagination and curiosity about the world around him, and especially about the business environment	21.				
22.	Clear and expressive in speaking; chooses words which clearly convey the material in a concise manner	22.				
23.	Recognizes, understands, and employs psychological principles in the teaching-learning process	23.				

		1 2 3 4 5
24.	Is able to adjust to students' level of comprehension and can provide well for individual differences	24. _ _ _ _ _
25.	Is able to guide students effectively in extra-class activities; i.e., clear and purposeful homework assignments and special individual or group projects	25. _ _ _ _ _
26.	Is proud of his profession and has pride in his work	26. _ _ _ _ _
	<u>Professional Preparation</u>	
27.	Is well prepared in subject matter to teach general business	27. _ _ _ _ _
28.	Possesses a repertoire of ideas for implementing the teaching and learning processes	28. _ _ _ _ _
29.	Continuously reads, discusses, and questions in the area of economics	29. _ _ _ _ _
30.	Sees guidance value in general business	30. _ _ _ _ _

APPENDIX B

BACKGROUND FACTORS OF GENERAL BUSINESS TEACHERS

Code_____

A. Please fill in the appropriate number on these blanks:

1. Years of Experience in Teaching _____

2. Years of Experience Teaching General Business _____

3. Years of Work Experience (besides teaching) _____

B. Please check the appropriate blanks:

4. College degrees earned:

___ B.S. ___B.A.

___ M.S. ___ M.A.

___ Ed. S. ___ Ed. D. or Ph. D.

5. Major in college:

____ Business Education

____ Social Studies

____ Home Economics

____ Other _____

6. Professional Preparation for Teaching General Business

____ Undergraduate methods course in teaching basic business subjects

____ Graduate methods course in teaching basic business courses

____ Special workshop in teaching basic business subjects

____Year in which workshop was completed

____ In-service sessions in teaching basic business subjects

____ Year in which sessions were completed

7. Are you certified to teach general business? ____ Yes ____No

8. Did you have student teaching experience in teaching general business? ____ Yes ____No

9. If you are not certified in general business, in what subjects are you certified?

_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

APPENDIX C

GENERAL BUSINESS TEACHER PERFORMANCE SPECIMEN CHEC..

DIRECTIONS: Below are listed performance statements which represent ... kinds of things students might observe their general business teacher doing sometime during the year. Read each statement. If you definitely remember having observed it during this class this year, place a check in the blank. If you do not immediately remember having observed it in this class during this year, leave the space blank. Check only those things you personally saw your general business teacher do this year. DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME.

___ 1. Gave too many tests.

___ 2. Used actual business forms, such as checks, to help students understand the topic.

___ 3. Was too strict.

___ 4. Helped students individually.

___ 5. Had an annoying habit of some kind.

___ 6. Showed favoritism to either boys or girls in the class.

___ 7. Was well prepared for class.

___ 8. Assigned homework and then did not talk about or collect it.

___ 9. Used the overhead projector to show materials about the topic being discussed.

___10. Let students go to the library to get additional information.

___11. Gave tests that were too hard.

___12. Let students express their opinions and ask questions in class.

___13. Gave tests that were too long.

___14. Did not explain thoroughly what we were studying.

___15. Reviewed material well just before a test.

___16. Could not do some of the problems or made mistakes in working them on the board.

___17. Became angry when students did not understand something or asked questions.

___18. Brought in guest speakers.

___19. Did not give any study time in class.

___20. Assigned all the questions and vocabulary at the end of every chapter.

___21. Had pets among the students.

___22. Made the course practical by helping students see how it applies to their lives.

___23. Did not make assignments clear.

___24. Covered the material too fast.

___25. Used the chalkboard to explain problems and to outline lessons.

___26. Let some students get by with misbehavior.

___27. Took the class on field trips.

___28. Did not give much homework.

___29. Gave advance notice about anything the class would be doing.

___30. Never gave extra credit for work done for the class.

___31. Let students talk to each other in class.

___32. Did not let students talk to each other in class.

___33. Had good class discipline.

___34. Used many references and practical examples and ideas to explain points.

___35. Gave projects for extra credit.

___36. Used films and filmstrips in class.

___37. Brought in and had students bring in supplementary materials on the subject.

___38. Reviewed homework, assignments, and tests to help students better understand.

___39. Never left the room except for emergencies.

___40. Gave boring lectures.

___41. Bothered students by walking around the room while they worked or took a test.

___42. Had a variety of activities so that the class did not get dull.

___43. Told jokes to relax the class.

___44. Gave a reasonable amount of time for students to turn in make-up work.

___45. Did not show enough films.

___46. Repeated an explanation as many times as needed for students to understand.

___47. Gave time in class to study or do homework.

___48. Controlled his or her temper very well.

___49. Assigned problems that students did not know how to work.

___50. Graded fairly.

___51. Did not joke with the class.

___52. Gave too much work in class--made students work the whole period.

___53. Brought too many personal experiences into the class.

___54. Let students try to teach some units.

___55. Had class discussions which allowed everyone to take part.

___56. Was not strict enough.

___57. Was pleasant with the students.

___58. Gave pop quizzes.

___59. Gave tests that were not difficult and that covered only what we had studied.

___60. Spent too much time on one subject.

___61. Picked on some students too much.

___62. Told students what would be on tests and when tests would be given.

___63. Gave too much homework.

___64. Gave students repsonsibility for their learning by assigning outside written work.

___65. Did not have enough variety in class activities.

___66. Talked too much in the class.

___67. Explained thoroughly and covered the material well.

___68. Became irritated or angry too easily.

BASED ON ALL OF YOUR OBSERVATIONS OF YOUR GENERAL BUSINESS TEACHER'S TEACHING PERFORMANCE, HOW WOULD YOU GRADE HIS OR HER OVER-ALL TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS? (Check one)

A	B	C	D	F
Excel-lent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor

THANK YOU.

APPENDIX D

May 3, 1971

Mr. Robert U. Coker
Regional Research and
Development Coordinator
Research Coordinating Unit
2020 Terrace Avenue
Knoxville, TN 37916

Dear Mr. Coker:

The enclosed document constitutes an indepth study of the qualities of an effective pre-vocational business education teacher. The study is based upon a selected population of East Tennessee high school business education teachers. I hope the enclosed study meets your approval.

Expenses totaling $225 were incurred while researching this study.

If there are any questions regarding this matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Betty Jean Brown

Betty Jean Brown